DOCUMENT RESUME

ED 140 114 CG 011 386

AUTHOR Fisher, Franklin G., Jr.
TITLE Assessment of Job Placement Services in Colleges with Predominantly Black Students. Volume 1, Summary Volume.
INSTITUTION Ultrasystems, Inc., Irvine, Calif.
SPONS AGENCY Employment and Training Administration (DOL), Washington, D.C.
REPORT NO US-8278-01
PUB DATE Dec 76
CONTRACT 20-06-75-11
NOTE 43p.; For related documents, see CG 011 387 and 388.

EDRS PRICE MF-$0.83 HC-$2.06 Plus Postage.
DESCRIPTORS *Black Colleges; *Black Students; *Caucasian Students; College Students; *Employment Services; Guidance Services; Higher Education; *Job Placement; Program Evaluation; *Student Employment; *Student Personnel Services; Surveys

ABSTRACT

A survey of 30 colleges, 15 with predominantly black students and 15 with predominantly white students, was conducted in 15 different states. The major objective of this study was to provide knowledge about the effectiveness of the placement process in a representative sample of four-year colleges with predominantly black student population and their white counterparts. The study identifies the formal system and informal network of placement activities as they occur at colleges and focuses on gathering data about the overall placement process, its function, its operation, and its effectiveness. In-person interviews were conducted at the selected colleges with college placement personnel, certain college administrators, certain faculty members, and graduating seniors. Questionnaires were mailed to certain 1974 graduates and employers who recruit at the selected colleges on a regular basis. The data collected was analyzed using SPSS (Statistical Package for the Social Sciences). (Author)

****
* Documents acquired by ERIC include many informal unpublished *
* materials not available from other sources. ERIC makes every effort *
* to obtain the best copy available. Nevertheless, items of marginal *
* reproducibility are often encountered and this affects the quality *
* of the microfiche and hardcopy reproductions ERIC makes available *
* via the ERIC Document Reproduction Service (EDRS). EDRS is not *
* responsible for the quality of the original document. Reproductions *
* supplied by EDRS are the best that can be made from the original. *
****

ED140114

CG

ASSESSMENT OF JOB PLACEMENT SERVICES IN COLLEGES WITH PREDOMINANTLY BLACK STUDENTS

BY: FRANKLIN G. FISHER, JR., PH.D.

PREPARED FOR:

U.S. DEPARTMENT OF LABOR
EMPLOYMENT AND TRAINING ADMINISTRATION
WASHINGTON, D.C. 20213

PREPARED BY:

ULTRASYSTEMS, INC.
2400 MICHELSON DRIVE
IRVINE, CALIFORNIA 92715

CG 011386

U S DEPARTMENT OF HEALTH EDUCATION & WELFARE NATIONAL INSTITUTE OF EDUCATION

THIS DOCUMENT HAS BEEN REPRODUCED EXACTLY AS RECEIVED FROM THE PERSON OR ORGANIZATION ORIGINATING IT. POINTS OF VIEW OR OPINIONS STATED DO NOT NECESSARILY REPRESENT OFFICIAL NATIONAL INSTITUTE OF EDUCATION POSITION OR POLICY

FINAL REPORT
CONTRACT NO. 20-06-75-11
DECEMBER 1976

VOLUME I
SUMMARY VOLUME

BIBLIOGRAPHIC DATA SHEET	1. Report No. US 8278-01	2.

4. Title and Subtitle

ASSESSMENT OF JOB PLACEMENT SERVICES IN COLLEGES WITH PREDOMINANTLY BLACK STUDENTS

5. Report Date: December 1975

6.

7. Author(s): Franklin G. Fisher, Jr., Ph.D.

8. Performing Organization Report No. US 8278-01

9. Performing Organization Name and Address

Ultrasystems, Inc.
2400 Michelson Drive
Irvine, CA 92715

10. Project/Task/Work Unit No.

11. Contract/Grant No. 20-06-75-11

12. Sponsoring Organization Name and Address

U.S. Department of Labor
Employment and Training Administration
Washington, D.C. 20213

13. Type of Report & Period Covered: Final, Oct. 1974 - Dec. 1976

14.

15. Supplementary Notes: This report consists of three volumes: Volume I: Summary Volume; Volume II: Technical Volume; Volume III: Case Study Reports.

16. Abstracts:

A survey of 30 colleges, 15 with predominantly black students and 15 with predominantly white students, was conducted in 15 different states. The major objective of this study was to provide knowledge about the effectiveness of the placement process in a representative sample of four-year colleges with predominantly black student population and their white counterparts. The study identifies the formal system and informal network of placement activities as they occur at colleges and focuses on gathering data about the overall placement process, its function, its operation, and its effectiveness. In-person interviews were conducted at the selected colleges with college placement personnel, certain college administrators, certain faculty members, and graduating seniors. Questionnaires were mailed to certain 1974 graduates and employers who recruit at the selected colleges on a regular basis. The data collected was analyzed using SPSS (Statistical Package for the Social Sciences).

17. Key Words and Document Analysis 17a. Descriptors

SPSS (Statistical Package for the Social Sciences)
Independent Variable; Co-op (Cooperative Education); Predominantly Black College; Predominantly White College; Parameter; Confidence Level; Statistical Significance; Job Placement Counseling; Placement Counseling; Placement Director

17b. Identifiers/Open-Ended Terms

17c. COSATI Field/Group

18. Availability Statement	19. Security Class (This Report)	21. No. of Pages
Release unlimited	UNCLASSIFIED	680
	20. Security Class (This Page) UNCLASSIFIED	

FORM NTIS-35 (REV. 10-73) ENDORSED BY ANSI AND UNESCO. THIS FORM MAY BE REPRODUCED USCOMM-DC 8265-P74

The opinions, findings, and conclusions expressed in this publication are those of the authors and not necessarily those of the Employment and Training Administration, U.S. Department of Labor.

PREFACE

The work described in this report was performed by Ultrasystems, Inc. for the U.S. Department of Labor under Contract No. 20-06-75-11 during the period 18 October 1974 to 31 December 1976. The DOL Project Officer was Ms. Diane Edwards. The Program Manager and Principal Investigator for Ultrasystems, Inc. was Dr. Franklin G. Fisher, Jr.

There were several significant contributors to the study effort, specifically, Mr. Randolph Eidemiller--with regards to statistics--and Mr. Steve Pond--with regards to the computer analyses. Both of the gentlemen just mentioned are employees of Ultrasystems.

The major subcontractor to Ultrasystems, for this study effort, was Optimum Computer Systems, a firm of research consultants from Washington, D.C.

VOLUME I: SUMMARY VOLUME

TABLE OF CONTENTS

Section No.		Page No.
1	INTRODUCTION	I-1
2	FINDINGS AND RECOMMENDATIONS	I-3
	2.1 GENERAL FINDINGS	I-3
	2.2 FINDINGS CHARACTERIZING SURVEYED COLLEGES . . .	I-5
	2.3 FINDINGS CHARACTERIZING THE SURVEYED GRADUATING SENIORS	I-6
	2.4 FINDINGS BASED ON FACULTY RESPONSES	I-6
	2.5 RECOMMENDATIONS	I-7
	2.5.1 Recommendations Based on Statistical Analysis of Collected Data	I-7
	2.5.2 Recommendations Based on Specific Placement Office Mechanisms	I-8
3	METHODOLOGY.	I-10
	3.1 DETERMINATION OF FACTORS TO BE EVALUATED . . .	I-10
	3.1.1 Evaluation of Major Problem Areas . . .	I-12
	3.2 DESIGN OF THE DATA COLLECTION INSTRUMENTS . . .	I-12
	3.3 SAMPLING PLAN	I-13
	3.4 COMPOSITION AND TRAINING OF SURVEY TEAMS . . .	I-14
4	PRESENTATION OF DATA	I-15
	4.1 GENERAL DISCUSSION	I-15
	4.1.1 Summary of Collected Data	I-16
	4.1.2 Data Acquisition Considerations	I-17

VOLUME I: SUMMARY VOLUME

TABLE OF CONTENTS (CONT.)

Section No.		Page No.
4.2	SUMMARY OF ANALYSES	I-18
4.2.1	Comparison of Student Responses - College Major As Independent Variable	I-18
4.2.1.1	General	I-18
4.2.1.2	Specific Findings	I-19

LIST OF TABLES

Table No.		Page No.
4.1-1	Overall Summary of Collected Data	I-16
4.2-1	Analysis of Student Responses - Five Largest Fields of Interest	I-21
4.2-2	Analysis of Student Responses - Seven Composite Major Field Groupings	I-25

1. INTRODUCTION

This report deals with a comparative assessment of the placement services provided to students in a matched paired sample of colleges with predominantly black students and colleges with predominantly white students. While the title of the study specifically emphasizes colleges with predominantly black students, the study, as actually conducted, placed equal emphasis on both predominantly black and predominantly white colleges and concentrated on a comparative assessment of them.

The major objective of the study was to provide knowledge about the effectiveness of the placement process in a sample of thirty colleges: fifteen with predominantly white students and fifteen with predominantly black students. This was done by on-campus interviewing of several groups of people at each college who have some type of direct relationship with the placement office. Also, companies that normally recruit at the survey colleges were sent questionnaires regarding their opinions about the effectiveness of the placement activities conducted by these colleges. The effectiveness of the surveyed placement offices was determined by the composite opinions of the survey respondents and the personal assessments of the survey team members.

This study, as stated in the title, was an assessment of what the various colleges do to assist students in finding jobs and was not an evaluation of the subject colleges. However, an attempt was made to compare the activities of colleges with predominantly black students against the colleges with predominantly white students to determine the relative effectiveness of each group. Also, attempts were made to identify various mechanisms used by particular colleges that appear to be highly effective in aiding students in their preparation for their working careers. Such mechanisms have been recommended for use by other colleges.

Two methodological approaches have been utilized in the preparation of this report: detail statistical analysis and the case study method. Statistical analyses of all collected data were made at a gross level by computer, using SPSS (Statistical Package for the Social Sciences) as the software package. The computer output was then organized and presented in a manner to enhance its usability. The results have been reported in terms of the significance or non-significance of the differences found in the two groups of colleges. A case study has been included on each of the colleges visited, however, said colleges are not identified in the reports in the interest of maintaining confidentiality.

The final report was organized and prepared in three volumes:

- Volume I - Summary Volume

  This volume presents an executive summary of the entire study.

- Volume II - Technical Volume

  This volume presents a detailed discussion of all technical aspects of the study. Included in this volume are the Findings and Recommendations, Research Design, Data Collection Activities, and Data Analyses.

- Volume III - Case Study Reports

  This volume presents a detailed discussion of the case study made at each of the thirty colleges visited. Even though the names of the colleges have been deleted to maintain anonymity, the colleges have been given a designation that enhances the use of the case studies.

2. FINDINGS AND RECOMMENDATIONS

2.1 GENERAL FINDINGS

1. There is a significantly higher number of companies recruiting at predominantly black colleges than at predominantly white colleges.

2. Colleges do not attract a sufficient number of recruiters to their campuses to satisfy the needs of the graduating students going into the job market.

3. There is a significant lack of statistics being kept by the colleges in both groups surveyed, thereby making it impossible to ascertain the exact number of students finding or not finding jobs and the particulars associated therewith.

4. Placement offices at predominantly black colleges have significantly higher operating budgets than their counterparts at predominantly white colleges. On the other hand, 56% of all placement directors (for both black and white colleges) indicated that they have inadequate placement budgets.

5. Placement directors at both predominantly black and predominantly white colleges feel that white students are more likely to have family connections and friends with connections that can assist them in acquiring a job. Both groups stated that many black students are first-generation college students and therefore their families do not have connections in the professional world nor do the students have many role models to emulate.

   The placement directors in predominantly white colleges felt that most professors tend to be white and therefore their personal favorites in their classes tend to be white and out of their same mold. When these professors hear about jobs, they usually refer students who they consider the cream-of-the-crop and these tend to be their favorite students. It was also stated that white professors are less likely to establish a close rapport with black students because of cultural biases.

6. The overwhelming majority of the students contacted were majoring in just a few different areas. Three areas--Education, Social Sciences, and Psychology--accounted for 48.2% of all students and Business and Management plus biological sciences accounted for another 27.3% of all students.

7. A large percentage of students major in areas that are projected to have a low potential for employment in the foreseeable future. As a consequence, only a very small percentage of the students are majoring in areas that are high potential employment areas.

8. Students that have graduated from college are significantly more critical of the placement office than students who have not graduated.

9. Alumni feel that their college course work was significantly less relevant to their field of training than do students who have not graduated.

10. White students and alumni were significantly more critical of the placement offices at white colleges than their black counterparts were of the placement offices at black colleges.

11. Black students depend on the placement office to find them a job to a significantly greater extent than their white counterparts.

12. White students depend on their own efforts to find a job to a significantly greater extent than black students.

13. Faculty members at white colleges are significantly more involved in providing direct student counseling and job referrals while faculty members at black colleges appear to be more involved in working with the students through the placement office.

14. In conjunction with the preceding finding, significantly more black colleges stated that they have a definite program for involving faculty members in the placement process.

15. Black colleges participate in Co-op programs at a significantly higher rate than their white counterparts.

16. Contrary to several of the preceding findings, employers who recruit at white colleges are significantly more satisfied with the assistance provided by the white placement offices than their counterparts who recruit at black colleges are with the assistance provided by the black placement offices.

17. Larger colleges place more importance on the placement function than smaller colleges.

18. Employers who recruit at small colleges do so mostly by invitation from the college. The main reason for their motivation to recruit at large colleges is the prospect of finding the type of student desired.

19. Alumni have the lowest opinion of the effectivenss of college placement activities of all of the groups surveyed. (The opinions of the alumni are considered of utmost importance because this group is in the best position to evaluate the output of the placement offices.)

20. The factors which companies consider in selecting schools for recruitment purposes, in the order of their importance, are as follows:

    - Candidate college has specialized school curriculum, e.g., engineering, education, physical sciences, etc., which are closely matched to needed employee skills.
    - Candidate college is noted for excellence of its graduates.
    - Company is satisfied with employees previously recruited from the candidate college.

21. The overall involvement of college administrators and faculty in the placement process must be considered "low" to "moderate." Said involvement was not found to be "high" at any of the colleges visited.

22. The most salient negative factor found in the overall career selection and the subsequent placement process was the lack of counseling to which students are exposed.

2.2 FINDINGS CHARACTERIZING THE SURVEYED COLLEGES

The findings presented here are based primarily on the results of the interviews with the thirty placement directors and their immediate supervisors.

In many instances, large differences were observed in the information gathered from the two groups of placement officers. However,

since the samples were so small--fifteen in each--the differences were not large enough to demonstrate statistical significance. Realizing this limitation, the differences found have been reported as being important, even though not statistically significant.

The findings which characterize the colleges surveyed have been partitioned into major subject areas to allow for a clearer visualization of the character of the colleges. Only the subject areas of the characterizing findings have been reported in this summary and they are as follows:

- Organizational Structure and Composition
- Operational Mechanisms and Services
- Services Supplied by Employers to Colleges
- Potential Areas of Constraint Endemic to the Colleges Sampled
- Self-Evaluation of Placement Activities

2.3 FINDINGS CHARACTERIZING THE SURVEYED GRADUATING SENIORS

The findings characterizing the students surveyed have been partitioned into major subject areas in order to provide the reader with a clear picture of all of the particulars. The categories used here were:

- Demographic Information
- Relationship of the Students to the Total Placement Services Available

2.4 FINDINGS BASED ON FACULTY RESPONSES

Several important findings with respect to faculty members were discovered. The subject areas associated with these findings are as follows:

- Faculty involvement in student job-search activity
- Manner in which faculty perceive their effectiveness in students' job-search efforts
- Faculty involvement with employment community
- Faculty involvement with placement offices
- Faculty opinion of the importance of the placement function
- Faculty opinion of the effectiveness of placement offices in placing students in jobs
- Faculty opinion of what parameters would be most beneficial in improving the placement function

2.5 RECOMMENDATIONS

2.5.1 Recommendations Based on a Statistical Analysis of the Collected Data

1. Colleges which have only a small number of companies recruiting at their campus each year should take specific steps, in a continuous and intensive manner, to encourage more companies to recruit at their respective campuses. (Many of the colleges visited do not actively seek out companies to recruit their students--rather, they wait to be contacted by the companies.)

2. Colleges should be encouraged to establish a specific budget line item for compiling statistics associated with recruiting, hiring, and other job-related activities. These statistics would be invaluable for establishing an operational baseline that is needed in order to improve the operations of placement offices.

3. Colleges should become more aware of alternate funding sources that can provide some of the funds needed to finance college placement activities and other essential functions. (There are many private foundations, etc., that could be potential funding sources for the colleges surveyed for this study.)

4. Placement offices at black colleges should develop a strategy for enhancing the formation of informal placement mechanisms to assist black students in their job-search activities.

5. A coordinated effort should be undertaken by college counselors and placement directors to make students fully aware of the employment limitations associated with the various fields of study, especially those that are popular with the majority of present-day students.

6. Placement directors should be required to conduct follow-up surveys of graduates on a periodic basis such that feedback relative to real-world experiences can be passed on to students such that areas for improvement can be recommended to placement offices.

7. College officials should place increased emphasis on counseling students with respect to both career counseling and job placement counseling. (Comments from all groups contacted on this subject indicate that counseling is an area of great deficiency.)

8. Colleges should establish formal programs for getting successful alumni involved with placement office activities. Alumni can be very helpful in providing contacts for graduating students and for inducing companies to participate with colleges by: (1) sending recruiters; (2) providing operating funds; and (3) donating equipment.

2.5.2 Recommendations Based on Specific Placement Office Mechanisms Found at the Schools Visited

A prime consideration of the researchers as they went from college to college was to attempt to discover any unique placement mechanisms being utilized by a particular college that would be useful for all colleges. There were no unique mechanisms discovered, in the strictest sense, however, there are certain mechanisms that stood out as being highly effective and universally applicable. These have been briefly discussed below in the form of recommendations.

1. Effectively operating Co-op programs appear to be a highly successful means of placing students in permanent jobs after graduation and it is recommended that all colleges should investigate the feasibility of establishing such programs.

2. Steering committees, made up of faculty and administrators, should be set up by college officials to work with the placement office as a means of involving key knowledgeable people in the placement process.

3. All graduating seniors should be required to register with the placement office in order to be in "good standing" with the administration. Conversely, all placement offices should be required to maintain a credentials file on all graduating seniors. A policy of this nature would ensure greater participation by students in the placement activities.

4. Placement offices should have special programs designed to acquaint students with the placement office activities and maintain their awareness for each of the four years of the students' college life. If students only become involved in the placement process in their senior year, they often lack the sophistication required to get the better jobs.

5. Placement offices must be proactive in their desire to attract recruiters to the campuses. They must take definite steps to solicit the participation of companies in their placement programs.

6. Placement offices should establish programs for assisting faculty members in getting summer jobs such that said faculty could in turn establish contacts that would assist graduating students in getting permanent jobs.

3. METHODOLOGY

This section presents the overall methodology utilized for performing the study, along with a discussion of the various tasks identified to meet the technical requirements of the contracted study. The overall methodology utilized for the study contained the following facets:

- Determination of an extensive list of factors that could be used to make comparative assessments between the two groups of colleges (black and white); said factors also had to provide the capability for making relative assessments of the individual colleges.
- Design of a set of survey instruments that possessed the capability for collecting all of the required data.
- Selection of a matched, paired sample of predominantly black and predominantly white colleges.
- The conducting of personal interviews and sending of direct mail questionnaires to the various identified respondent groups.
- The compilation and presentation of the collected data in both a research and analysis format, as well as a case study format.

The above methodology provided for the successful completion of all tasks established for the study. These tasks are identified and discussed in the text that follows.

3.1 DETERMINATION OF FACTORS TO BE EVALUATED

The essence of the placement function cannot begin to be understood by simply viewing it as an activity whose purpose it is to assist students find jobs. The job market that the students are trying to penetrate has so many facets and there are so many underlying philosophical issues until a much more encompassing viewpoint must be taken.

For example, the many facets of the job market include such things as the ever-changing demands of the market resulting from the cyclic nature of world commerce in terms of the types and numbers of professionals that will be required in the foreseeable future; the overarching economic conditions of the world and the United States in terms of growth and decline of the general marketplace; the glamor and desirability of certain professions in terms of how many students are attracted to pursuing said professions, thereby affecting the supply and demand; and the structural changes that occur in the marketplace which result from advancing technology, thereby creating and eliminating various jobs. Examples of the impact of philosophical issues include such things as the desire by some administrators and state government officials to curtail college enrollments and add practical training for non-academic careers to the scholarly training they traditionally provide versus those that warn, especially senior faculty members and academic purists, that such changes would diminish the college's contribution to research and to the scholarly training that they traditionally provide; the understandable but often destructive propensity of many professors to continue to teach and influence students to major in subject areas that are no longer viable in today's marketplace because of the self-sustaining vested interest of said professors; and the structural changes that are occurring in our country and the world as we move from an advanced industrial society to a post-industrial society.

While many of the issues addressed in the preceding paragraph are beyond the explicit purpose and objectives of the study to which this report is addressed, it was felt by the researchers that the overriding significance of said issues was such that consideration had to be given them in the design of factors against which the college placement activities would be evaluated. The factors discussed in the subsequent subparagraphs reflect this philosophy.

3.1.1 Evaluation of Major Problem Areas

There were five major evaluative areas used to investigate the operations of placement offices. While most colleges did not have sufficient data (i.e., detailed statistics) for one to make a definitive assessment of many of the factors associated with each evaluative area, it was possible to glean enough information to arrive at meaningful findings. The five major evaluative areas can be seen as follows:

- Budget
- Personnel
- Communication Interfaces
- Record-keeping and Library Functions
- Special Programs

3.2 DESIGN OF THE DATA COLLECTION INSTRUMENTS

The preceding section laid out the major evaluative areas that would be investigated and specified the various groups with whom the placement office carried on the bulk of its communications. This, then, prescribed the number of different questionnaires that had to be developed and the type of information that had to be covered in the questions included on each questionnaire.

The major overriding consideration in designing the questionnaires was that the design must promote the accurate collection of all desired information. The accuracy of the recorded data is highly dependent upon the simplicity, clarity, and ease of use of the data collection instruments. With this in mind, care was taken to insure that the forms possess all of the characteristics that would facilitate the data collection. The questionnaires have been included in the Appendix to the Technical Volume. It can be seen that many different types of questions

were utilized, open-ended, forced choice, Likert Scales, etc. The idea was to utilize the type of question that could best elicit the information desired. The various types of questionnaires developed for the study were:

- Placement Office Staff Questionnaire
- Administrators' Questionnaire
- Faculty Questionnaire
- Graduating Students' Questionnaire
- Alumni Questionnaire
- Employers' Questionnaire

3.3 SAMPLING PLAN

There were many colleges that appeared as likely candidates for this study. There are some eighty-five-plus predominantly black colleges and thousands of predominantly white colleges. Most of the predominantly black colleges are small, ranging from less than 500 students to over 9,000 students. However, DOL stipulated that only colleges with enrollments over 1,000 should be considered. Only in one instance was it necessary to waive this constraint. For the purpose of drawing the sample of colleges, it was decided that only one predominantly black and one predominantly white college would be selected in each state. This limited the number of states that had to be considered because predominantly black four-year colleges occur only in nineteen different states.

Since many of the colleges eligible for the study would necessarily have small graduating classes and small faculty and administrative bodies, the sample size for each respondent group was influenced by this constraining factor.

3.4 COMPOSITION AND TRAINING OF SURVEY TEAMS

It was decided that three teams of researchers would be utilized for the study. Each team had two members, one black and one white. One member of each team was designated as the team captain. Two of the teams had one female member and one male member, the third team had two male members. All of the team members had prior experience in survey research and thus the extent of the training could be minimized. Four of the team members were employees of Ultrasystems and two of the members were subcontracted from Optimum Computers Systems, Inc., a Washington, D.C.-based, black-owned firm.

The team members were convened for one week of training. The training consisted of the following things:

- Familiarization with the purpose and objectives of the study.
- Familiarization with the contents of the six types of survey instruments.
- Pre-test of the survey instruments.
- Familiarization with the guidelines for conducting the field work.

4. PRESENTATION OF DATA

4.1 GENERAL DISCUSSION

This section presents the analysis of the data resulting from effort expended, as described in the preceding sections of this report. A three-level analysis approach was utilized to analyze all of the collected data, except that collected with the Placement Staff Questionnaire. The first level of analysis consisted of analyzing all of the open-end questions by content analysis techniques. The second level of analysis consisted of utilizing SPSS (Statistical Package for the Social Sciences) to perform a gross analysis of all closed-end questions. Third level analysis involved refining the gross analyses performed by the SPSS in order to discover any subtleties that exist. Since the sample of respondents to the Placement Staff Questionnaire was relatively small, and since certain of the data collected by this questionnaire was of a special nature, i.e., budget size, etc., the data was analyzed by manual techniques, only using a desk-top computer.

Only those analyses whose inclusion adds substance to the report have been documented here. For example, the tabulations derived from the content analyses have been omitted because they would contribute nothing to the understanding of the report. However, all meaningful conclusions from the content analyses have been included in the findings in section 2.

In general, the analyses included here have been structured in an objective-oriented manner. This means that a specific analysis has been made, where applicable, that corresponds with each objective and research question. This approach served as a point of departure for other types of analysis. Some analyses have been made that are not direct fall-outs of the stated study objectives but have been included because they shed light on problem areas and situations that are of vital concern to placement personnel.

4.1.1 Summary of Collected Data

Table 4.1-1 presents a summary of all interview data collected. From the summary presented in this table, it can be seen that the respondents in all categories were fairly evenly divided except for the alumni. There is no apparent reason for the low percentage of alumni respondents from the black colleges. Alumni mailing lists were obtained from all colleges except six. Of these six colleges, three were black and three were white. One hundred letters were sent to alumni from each of the twenty-four colleges that supplied mailing lists. The overall response rate for alumni was 27.3%. However, when viewing this by college type, it can be seen that the response rate from black colleges was 17.4% while the response rate from white colleges was 37.1%.

The overall response rate from recruiters was 35.5%. However, when taken separately, the response rate for recruiters regarding their experiences at black colleges was 32.5%, whereas the response rate from recruiters regarding their experiences at white colleges was 40.3%.

TABLE 4.1-1. OVERALL SUMMARY OF COLLECTED DATA

Questionnaire Type	Black College Respondents	White College Respondents	Total Respondents
1. Placement Office Staff	25	25	50
2. Non-Placement Administrators	25	29	54
3. Faculty	117	128	245
4. Students (1975 Graduates)	1,478	1,424	2,902
5. Alumni (1974 Graduates)	209	446	655
6. Employers (Recruiting at Respective Colleges)	273	213	486

4.1.2 Data Acquisition Considerations

The questionnaires for the placement staff, administrators, faculty, and graduating students were administered through personal interviews. The determining factor in whether or not the desired number of interviews were conducted usually depended on the availability of the prospective respondents. There was no difficulty in locating and scheduling interviews with placement staff personnel. Non-placement administrators were somewhat more difficult to reach. Usually, the administrator of interest, the person to whom the placement director reported, was the Vice President for Student Affairs or the Dean of Students, and these people are often difficult to reach because of their busy schedules. Faculty members were not difficult to reach because they could always be contacted at a scheduled class meeting. However, since the prime interest was in interviewing faculty who were closely involved with helping students find jobs, the universe of faculty members of interest was considerably diminished from the total universe of faculty members.

The graduating students were the most difficult to reach. The majority of the time spent at each campus was spent in search of graduating seniors. Since this group was not readily identifiable, various means had to be devised to locate them. The one method that produced the largest number of respondents involved contacting faculty members who taught upper division classes, asking them if they had seniors in their classes, and securing permission to come to their classes and use a portion of their class time to interview the seniors. One of the thirty colleges visited had a class roster with each student's classification for each class on the schedule of classes. This roster was maintained by the registrar's office and was so useful that it was possible to finish all interviewing in three days, whereas it usually took four to five days.

4.2 SUMMARY OF ANALYSES

Many different categories were devised for performing the various desired analyses. Within each category, several subcategories were utilized to insure that the analyses were both comprehensive and inclusive. As an example, the first category, Analysis of Student Responses, had four subcategories: 1) Analysis: Male vs. Female Responses; 2) Comparison of Student Responses - College Major as Independent Variable; 3) Analysis of Student Responses - Black vs. White Students; and 4) Analysis of Responses for Students vs. Alumni. For the purposes of the Summary Volume, only one of the subcategories within the first category has been included here. This will be discussed in the paragraphs that follow.

4.2.1 Comparison of Student Responses - College Major As Independent Variable

4.2.1.1 General

It was considered that an analysis of the students' responses, resulting from grouping the students by their major fields, may reveal certain useful significant differences. There were two levels of analysis made by grouping the student responses according to major subject fields. The first was based on choosing the five major field categories in which most students indicated that they were majoring, and the second analysis was made by merging similar major fields in such a manner that seven categories were formed.

For the first analysis, the five fields most frequently indicated by students can be seen as follows, along with the percentage of students indicating that field as their major field:

1.	Education	26.6%
2.	Business and Management	21.6%
3.	Social Sciences	15.6%
4.	Psychology	6.0%
5.	Biological Sciences	5.7%
	Total	75.5%

From the preceding listing it can be seen that over 75% of the students surveyed were majoring in just five categories out of a total of 55 categories in which students indicated they were majoring.

For the second analysis, seven general major field categories were devised that subsume all of the 55 specific major categories in which students were majoring. A convention used by the National Center for Educational Statistics, U.S. Office of Education, was used as a guide for condensing the major field categories. The seven category groupings, along with the percentage of respondents represented by each, can be seen as follows:

1. Education 26.6%
2. Business Management and Law; Business and Commercial Technology 21.9%
3. Social Sciences and Public Affairs; Home Economics; Area Studies; Communications; Interdisciplinary Studies; Theology 19.8%
4. Psychology 6.0%
5. Biological Sciences; Agriculture; Health Professions; Health Services; Paramedics 8.4%
6. Letters and Fine and Applied Arts; Foreign Languages 7.8%
7. Physical Sciences; Mathematics; Architecture; Computer and Information Science; Mechanical and Engineering Technology 9.1%

4.2.1.2 Specific Findgings

Tables 4.2-1 and 4.2-2 present the overall tabulations of the statistical analysis results for these comparisons.

The highest overall placement office effectiveness ratings were given by Education majors, while the least satisfied groups were the Psychology and Social Science majors.

Education majors also expressed the highest awareness of the placement office but were the least willing group to accept an out-of-state job. These results may be simply reflecting the male/female

differences noted in the preceding section, since there is a preponderance of female students majoring in Education.

As far as placement office usage itself, however, it was Business and Management majors who used the placement office most frequently. Psychology and Biology majors were the least frequent users.

Of those obtaining jobs through the placement office, Business and Management, Physical Science, and Education majors received the largest percentage of jobs related to college major (over 70% each), while Psychology major jobs were the least related (only 41%).

Education majors, as a group, decided on their major far earlier than all other groups. For example, fully 18% of Education majors stated that their decision was made prior to high school, compared to corresponding percentages of from 3.9% - 7.7% for the other 6 major groupings. Education majors were also the most aware group of current job demand and starting salaries. The least aware groups were Psychology and Letters and Arts majors.

The most active placement office job searches and successes were for Education, Business and Management, and Physical Science majors who were also the groups which rated the placement office the highest for success in attracting company recruiters.

TABLE 4.2-1. ANALYSIS OF STUDENT RESPONSES - FIVE LARGEST FIELDS OF INTEREST

VAR.	QUESTION	ANS.	% Response EDUCATION	BUSINESS & MGMT.	SOCIAL SCIENCE	PSY-CHOLOGY	BIOLOGY	x^2	SIG.	
405	Accept job in another state?	Yes	70.1	90.3	84.5	82.3	85.7	68.11	+++	(.0000)
409	Aware of placement office?	Yes	95.6	95.1	94.4	94.6	93.6	1.65	-	
	How you became aware of placement office?									
410	(a) school orientation	X*	46.6	43.6	42.6	41.9	46.8	2.95	-	
411	(b) interview counseling	X	17.7	21.6	22.7	16.2	10.1	16.18	++	(.003)
412	(c) from fellow students	X	28.9	27.9	21.8	31.1	24.7	9.43		(.051)
414	How familiar with placement office?	Very	20.2	30.4	22.1	14.6	16.9			
		Mod.	57.0	51.4	55.1	51.0	55.4	41.55	+++	(.0000)
		Not	22.8	18.2	22.8	34.4	27.7			
415	Ever used placement office?	Yes	54.6	62.6	57.1	[illegible].9	49.4	23.82	+++	(.0001)
416	(a) career planning counseling	X	11.0	10.7	13.2	11.4	10.8	1.89	-	
417	(b) interview counseling	X	21.6	21.9	13.9	11.4	17.7	20.22	+++	(.0005)
418	(c) job placement counseling	X	21.3	22.1	16.7	9.0	15.8	19.48	+++	(.0006)
419	(d) assistance with resume	X	20.1	20.9	18.1	16.2	14.6	5.04	-	
420	(e) employer interviews	X	27.3	43.5	27.4	19.8	25.9	62.28	+++	(.0000)
422	Number of job interviews from placement office	0	47.7	33.2	45.6	69.4	42.0			
		1-2	27.2	18.9	26.0	6.3	24.0			
		3-5	14.8	22.0	16.1	17.1	15.0	12.01	+++	(.0000)
		6-10	7.9	13.6	8.8	6.3	13.0			
		11+	2.4	12.3	3.5	0.9	6.0			
	Interviewed in what year									
423	(a) freshman	X	1.6	3.7	2.1	3.0	0.6	8.74		(.068)
424	(b) sophomore	X	3.3	8.0	4.6	4.8	3.2	17.39	++	(.0016)
425	(c) junior	X	8.6	14.4	13.9	8.4	6.3	19.63	+++	(.0006)
426	(d) senior	X	33.7	47.0	32.9	21.0	37.3	50.62	+++	(.0000)
427	Career counseling from instructors	X	53.3	49.5	48.5	49.1	53.2	3.65	-	
428	Career counseling from administrators	X	10.9	12.7	11.1	11.4	12.7	1.37	-	
430	Compare this counseling with career counseling received from placement office	Better	28.7	27.8	31.4	49.2	45.2			
		Same	64.0	65.6	62.8	47.5	51.6	17.66	+++	(.0000)
		Worse	7.3	6.6	5.8	3.3	3.2			
431	Placement counseling/instructors	X	33.3	33.3	26.5	19.2	26.6	19.51	+++	(.0006)
432	Placement counseling/college administrators	X	9.2	11.0	11.1	7.8	11.4	2.92	-	
434	Compare this counseling with placement counseling received from placement office	Better	29.0	29.0	31.6	50.0	36.2			
		Same	66.1	67.5	64.7	44.1	59.6	8.64	-	
		Worse	4.9	3.5	3.8	5.9	4.3			
435	Counseling from sources other than placement office aided in finding job	Yes	57.8	57.5	51.2	50.0	47.1	4.14	-	

*X indicates item checked

TABLE 4.2-1. (Cont.)

VAR.	QUESTION	ANS.	% Response EDUCATION	BUSINESS & MGMT.	SOCIAL SCIENCE	PSY-CHOLOGY	BIOLOGY	x^2	SIG.	
436	Have or will have job by 6/75 (compared to 9/75)	Yes	53.9	72.6	74.7	82.0	81.4	42.44	+++	(.0000)
	Type of job									
437	(a) summer	X	10.3	6.9	13.7	19.8	28.2	43.87	+++	(.0000)
438	(b) part-time	X	7.3	8.0	7.9	10.8	9.5	2.63	-	
439	(c) work-study	X	3.0	2.0	2.1	1.2	1.9	2.89	-	
440	(d) Co-op	X	0.4	2.0	0.5	1.2	0.0	12.60	+	(.0134)
441	(e) full-time	X	28.9	36.8	29.7	18.0	19.6	33.26	+++	(.0000)
443	Job related to major field	Yes	70.8	76.2	48.6	41.1	54.5	70.31	+++	(.0000)
444	Grade level college major decided on	1-8	18.0	4.2	4.7	3.9	6.9			
		9-10	8.4	4.3	6.0	4.6	11.7			
		11-12	22.1	19.7	19.3	14.5	22.8			
		Coll. 1	26.3	27.4	28.8	30.9	24.1	149.15	+++	(.0000)
		Coll. 2	17.8	27.0	26.0	30.9	24.1			
		Coll. 3	6.2	15.8	13.7	12.5	9.7			
		Coll. 4	1.2	1.6	1.5	2.6	0.7			
445	Most important factor in deciding career									
	(a) Own efforts	X	95.4	94.9	94.9	95.7	98.4			
	(b) Placement office	X	1.8	2.1	0.8	1.4	0.0			
	(c) Recruiting personnel	X	1.9	1.6	1.3	2.1	0.0	25.18		(.067)
	(d) State Employment Service	X	0.6	0.2	2.2	0.7	0.0			
	(e) Private employment agency	X	0.3	1.2	0.8	0.0	1.5			
446	Courses patterned toward career goal	Yes	94.2	92.8	83.0	87.4	95.5	50.40	+++	(.0000)
447	Relevancy of courses to career field									
	(a) Excellent	X	31.7	23.0	16.1	17.2	25.2			
	(b) Good	X	52.9	56.9	50.1	45.7	56.5	95.90	+++	(.0000)
	(c) Fair	X	13.5	17.1	26.8	31.1	15.0			
	(d) Poor	X	1.9	2.9	7.1	6.0	3.4			
	How placement office disperses information									
448	(a) Bulletin board	X	67.3	75.9	70.3	68.3	65.8	14.17	++	(.0068)
449	(b) School paper	X	27.4	27.1	32.9	25.1	28.5	6.09	-	
450	(c) Phone calls	X	6.1	5.9	6.5	5.4	8.9	2.27	-	
451	(d) By mail	X	33.0	33.1	33.2	36.5	46.2	11.44	+	(.022)
453	Placement office adequately informs students	Yes	70.6	65.1	63.0	57.2	68.3	12.70	+	(.013)
454	Overall current placement office effectiveness									
	(a) Outstanding	X	9.0	4.8	3.9	3.8	4.7			
	(b) Very good	X	49.4	42.1	39.0	30.8	51.9			
	(c) Mediocre	X	27.8	36.5	38.1	44.4	31.0	52.61	+++	(.0000)
	(d) Fair	X	10.0	11.7	12.2	14.3	7.0			
	(e) Poor	X	3.9	4.8	6.9	6.8	5.4			
467	Aware of present demand in field	Yes	88.1	82.8	80.2	75.2	82.2	22.91	+++	(.0001)
	How YES information obtained									
468	(a) Placement office	X	20.5	14.9	13.9	7.2	15.2	22.74	+++	(.0000)
469	(b) Instructors	X	60.1	43.1	39.0	47.6	40.5	65.95	+++	(.0000)
470	(c) Recruiters	X	21.9	26.4	17.9	10.8	24.1	23.88	+++	(.0001)

TABLE 4.2-1. (Cont.)

VAR.	QUESTION	ANS.	% Response EDUCATION	BUSINESS & MGMT.	SOCIAL SCIENCE	PSY-CHOLOGY	BIOLOGY	x^2	SIG.	
474	Aware of future employment projections in field	Yes	74.8	74.4	69.0	63.9	73.5	11.76	+	(.019)
	How YES information obtained									
475	(a) Placement office	X	15.1	13.0	10.9	6.0	15.2	12.48	+	(.014)
476	(b) Instructors	X	53.0	37.1	35.5	43.7	35.4	52.02	+++	(.0000)
477	(c) Recruiters	X	15.5	22.7	14.8	10.2	23.4	25.43	+++	(.0000)
479	Aware of starting salaries in field	Yes	83.1	82.5	72.7	65.6	66.5	51.21	+++	(.0000)
	How YES information obtained									
480	(a) Placement office	X	16.3	12.4	10.4	4.8	10.8	21.71	+++	(.0002)
481	(b) Instructors	X	38.9	35.6	26.9	34.7	18.4	35.41	+++	(.0000)
482	(c) Recruiters	X	26.6	31.4	20.2	10.2	24.1	39.02	+++	(.0000)
484	Placement office actively searched for a job for you	Yes	16.6	15.4	11.8	5.5	9.0	17.83	++	(.0013)
485	Placement office instrumental in finding a job for you	Yes	22.9	23.5	18.8	10.7	13.6	18.11	++	(.0012)
	If YES, kind of job									
486	(a) Summer	X	3.7	4.8	3.2	4.2	2.5	2.87	-	
487	(b) Part-time	X	3.4	5.0	4.6	3.6	1.9	4.63	-	
488	(c) Full-time	X	17.5	15.7	12.5	3.0	11.4	26.76	+++	(.0000)
489	(d) Work-study	X	3.1	2.2	1.4	1.8	1.3	4.87	-	
[illegible]	Job related to major field	Yes	76.7	78.8	50.0	25.0	61.1	68.51	+++	(.0000)
492	Rate placement office effort to attract company recruiters									
	(a) Excellent	X	17.9	16.2	12.5	10.3	16.7			
	(b) Good	X	57.7	49.2	48.5	37.4	46.7	48.41	+++	(.0000)
	(c) Fair	X	21.2	28.8	30.2	43.9	29.2			
	(d) Poor	X	3.3	5.9	8.8	8.4	7.5			
493	Rate placement office success in attracting company recruiters in your field									
	(a) Excellent	X	17.3	17.6	5.6	4.3	13.8			
	(b) Good	X	43.9	48.0	27.9	12.2	30.9	215.8	+++	(.0000)
	(c) Fair	X	27.2	23.2	36.8	31.3	24.4			
	(d) Poor	X	11.6	11.2	29.7	52.2	30.9			
494	Importance of placement function as viewed by college officials									
	(a) High	X	39.0	30.5	23.7	18.2	23.9			
	(b) Moderate	X	50.7	49.8	50.0	49.7	50.7	95.16	+++	(.0000)
	(c) Low	X	9.8	18.1	23.7	28.7	19.0			
	(d) None	X	0.5	1.5	2.7	3.5	6.3			
495	Are placement activities treated as a major component of the educational process?	Yes	47.9	44.9	35.8	18.3	36.7	54.5	+++	(.0000)
496	If NO, do you believe they should be?	Yes	94.1	94.5	93.1	95.4	90.9	2.60	-	

TABLE 4.2-1. (Cont.)

VAR.	QUESTION	ANS.	% Response EDUCATION	BUSINESS & MGMT.	SOCIAL SCIENCE	PSY-CHOLOGY	BIOLOGY	X^2	SIG.	
497	Rate the ability of the placement office to provide career counseling									
	(a) Excellent	X	13.8	9.5	7.7	7.4	12.1			
	(b) Good	X	48.0	45.0	45.2	27.8	44.4			
	(c) Fair	X	29.5	33.1	34.2	45.4	33.1	35.37	+++	(.0004)
	(d) Poor	X	8.7	12.4	12.9	19.4	10.5			
498	Rate the ability of the placement office to provide job placement counseling									
	(a) Excellent	X	12.7	7.6	7.8	5.3	9.2			
	(b) Good	X	49.9	44.8	43.6	33.6	45.0			
	(c) Fair	X	28.1	35.8	34.5	44.2	37.5	34.85	+++	(.0005)
	(d) Poor	X	9.3	11.8	14.0	16.8	8.3			
	If the placement office has not been adequate for you to what do you attribute deficiency?									
499	(a) Inadequate staff	X	18.3	19.9	20.6	17.4	17.7	1.71	-	
500	(b) Lack of counseling experience	X	9.4	9.9	9.3	7.8	8.9	0.72	-	
501	(c) Insufficient contact with work world	X	16.0	22.2	26.0	27.5	19.6	22.41	+++	(.0002)
502	(d) Staff disinterest	X	7.3	7.7	8.1	12.0	8.9	4.21	-	
	How do you think you will most likely obtain your first job after graduating?									
504	(a) Own efforts	X	62.4	55.9	66.1	74.3	67.7	25.39	+++	(.0000)
505	(b) Placement office	X	25.1	22.7	12.5	6.6	13.9	53.06	+++	(.0000)
506	(c) Instructor's assistance	X	10.2	7.0	9.7	12.6	16.5	14.63	++	(.0055)
507	(d) Relative's assistance	X	10.2	9.2	11.8	13.8	19.0	14.09	++	(.0070)
508	(e) Friend's assistance	X	14.5	12.0	14.6	15.6	13.9	2.56	-	

I-24

Significance Code:

- \- = Not significant.
- \+ = Significant at 95% confidence level.
- ++ = Significant at 99% confidence level.
- +++ = Significant at 99.9% confidence level.

TABLE 4.2-2. ANALYSIS OF STUDENT RESPONSES - SEVEN COMPOSITE MAJOR FIELD GROUPINGS

VAR.	QUESTION	ANS.	% Response: EDUCATION	BUSINESS & MGMT.	SOCIAL SCIENCE	PSYCHOLOGY	BIOLOGY	LETTERS & ARTS	PHYSICAL SCIENCE	X^2	SIG.
405	Accept job in another state?	Yes	70.1	90.5	83.4	82.3	86.5	85.6	90.1	81.04	+++ (.0000)
409	Aware of placement office?	Yes	95.6	95.2	94.7	94.6	89.7	92.1	95.3	15.53	+ (.016)
	How you became aware of placement office?										
410	(a) school orientation	X*	46.6	43.2	43.1	41.9	42.5	45.2	41.5	3.52	-
411	(b) interview counseling	X	17.7	21.7	21.2	16.2	14.2	12.9	17.6	15.41	+ (.017)
412	(c) from fellow students	X	28.9	28.3	23.0	31.1	25.3	22.6	32.6	13.27	+ (.039)
414	How familiar with placement office?	Very	20.2	30.1	22.8	14.6	13.8	15.3	27.9		
		Mod.	57.0	51.6	53.9	51.0	54.3	58.9	42.1	66.59	+++ (.0000)
		Not	22.8	18.3	23.3	34.4	31.9	25.7	30.1		
415	Ever used placement office?	Yes	54.6	62.2	56.2	43.9	43.9	48.1	51.6	36.79	+++ (.0000)
416	(a) career planning counseling	X	11.0	10.5	13.1	11.4	9.4	9.7	9.8	3.78	-
417	(b) interview counseling	X	21.6	21.9	13.6	11.4	15.5	14.7	19.7	27.57	+++ (.0001)
418	(c) job placement counseling	X	21.3	21.9	15.4	9.0	13.3	16.1	19.2	27.30	+++ (.0001)
419	(d) assistance with resume	X	20.1	20.9	19.1	16.2	12.0	18.0	17.6	10.70	(.098)
420	(e) employer interviews	X	27.3	43.2	26.3	19.8	21.5	22.6	32.1	79.08	+++ (.0000)
422	Number of job interviews from placement office	0	47.7	33.2	47.5	69.4	50.0	52.5	42.3		
		1-2	27.2	19.0	25.3	6.3	23.3	28.7	20.3		
		3-5	14.8	21.8	15.9	17.1	12.7	12.3	12.2	147.8	+++ (.0000)
		6-10	7.9	13.8	8.0	6.3	10.0	4.1	15.4		
		11+	2.4	12.2	3.3	.9	4.0	2.5	9.8		
	Interviewed in what year										
423	(a) freshman	X	1.6	3.8	2.0	3.0	0.4	3.7	2.6	12.90	+ (.045)
424	(b) sophomore	X	3.3	7.9	4.7	4.8	3.9	2.3	4.1	20.48	++ (.0023)
425	(c) junior	X	8.6	14.2	13.1	8.4	9.9	4.1	11.4	25.38	+++ (.0003)
426	(d) senior	X	33.7	46.6	32.1	21.0	30.9	27.6	33.7	60.22	+++ (.0000)
427	Career counseling from instructors	X	53.3	49.9	50.5	49.1	60.5	56.7	55.4	11.63	+ (.071)
428	Career counseling from administrators	X	10.9	12.9	10.7	11.4	11.6	6.9	11.9	6.05	-
430	Compare this counseling with career counseling received from placement office	Better	28.7	28.6	32.1	49.2	43.9	26.0	48.6		
		Same	64.0	64.9	62.9	47.5	53.7	69.9	47.1	28.57	++ (.0046)
		Worse	7.3	6.5	5.0	3.3	2.4	4.1	4.3		
431	Placement counseling/instructors	X	33.3	33.6	28.7	19.2	35.6	24.0	38.3	27.94	+++ (.0001)
432	Placement counseling/college administrators	X	9.2	11.0	9.6	7.8	9.0	6.5	11.4	5.50	-
434	Compare this counseling with placement counseling received from placement office	Better	29.0	29.7	32.2	50.0	40.8	31.4	43.5		
		Same	66.1	66.9	63.8	44.1	54.9	64.7	52.2	14.56	-
		Worse	4.9	3.4	4.0	5.9	4.2	3.9	4.3		
435	Counseling from sources other than placement office aided in finding job	Yes	57.8	57.0	49.0	50.0	52.3	37.3	48.7	11.08	(.086)

*X indicates item checked

TABLE 4.2-2. (Cont.)

VAR.	QUESTION	ANS.	% Response EDUCATION	BUSINESS & MGMT.	SOCIAL SCIENCE	PSYCHOLOGY	BIOLOGY	LETTERS & ARTS	PHYSICAL SCIENCE	X^2	SIG.
436	Have or will have job by 6/75 (compared to 9/75)	Yes	53.9	72.7	74.5	82.0	85.1	76.5	75.9	55.71	+++ (.0000)
	Type of job										
437	(a) summer	X	10.3	7.1	12.5	19.8	20.6	18.4	14.0	49.10	+++ (.0000)
438	(b) part-time	X	7.3	8.1	7.8	10.8	8.6	10.1	9.3	3.72	-
439	(c) work-study	X	3.0	2.0	2.4	1.2	2.1	3.7	2.6	4.02	-
440	(d) Co-op	X	0.4	2.0	0.4	1.2	0.4	0.0	1.6	16.12	+ (.013)
441	(e) full-time	X	28.9	36.6	28.9	18.0	18.5	24.9	32.1	42.11	+++ (.0000)
443	Job related to major field	Yes	70.8	76.2	53.4	41.1	57.3	60.4	72.2	64.30	+++ (.0000)
444	Grade level college major decided on	1-8	18.0	4.3	4.9	3.9	7.7	7.4	5.5		
		9-10	8.4	4.3	5.1	4.6	12.9	7.4	11.0		
		11-12	22.1	19.8	20.2	14.5	22.0	23.3	24.9		
		Coll. 1	26.3	27.5	29.1	30.9	27.3	20.8	29.3	188.7	+++ (.0000)
		Coll. 2	17.8	27.0	24.4	30.9	20.1	29.2	14.9		
		Coll. 3	6.2	15.5	14.9	12.5	9.1	10.9	11.6		
		Coll. 4	1.2	1.6	1.4	2.6	1.0	1.0	2.8		
445	Most important factor in deciding career										
	(a) Own efforts	X	95.4	95.0	95.1	95.7	98.0	98.3	96.4		
	(b) Placement office	X	1.8	2.1	0.6	1.4	0.0	0.6	0.6		
	(c) Recruiting personnel	X	1.9	1.5	1.3	2.1	1.0	0.6	2.4	38.95	+ (.028)
	(d) State Employment Service	X	0.6	0.2	2.3	0.7	0.0	0.6	0.0		
	(e) Private employment agency	X	0.3	1.2	0.6	0.0	1.0	0.0	0.6		
446	Courses patterned toward career goal	Yes	94.2	92.7	84.3	87.4	94.7	85.2	91.4	52.91	+++ (.0000)
447	Relevancy of courses to career field										
	(a) Excellent	X	31.7	23.0	18.6	17.2	32.1	18.8	28.2		
	(b) Good	X	52.9	56.7	49.8	45.7	49.8	53.5	59.1	114.1	+++ (.0000)
	(c) Fair	X	13.5	17.4	25.5	31.1	14.9	20.3	12.7		
	(d) Poor	X	1.9	3.1	6.1	6.0	3.2	7.4	0.0		
	How placement office disperses information										
448	(a) Bulletin board	X	67.3	76.1	69.1	68.3	65.7	59.0	68.9	26.84	+++ (.0002)
449	(b) School paper	X	27.4	27.2	32.7	25.1	26.2	32.7	24.4	10.68	(.099)
450	(c) Phone calls	X	6.1	5.9	5.8	5.4	7.3	5.1	4.7	1.77	-
451	(d) By mail	X	33.0	32.6	33.2	36.5	36.9	35.0	40.9	6.48	-
453	Placement office adequately informs students	Yes	70.6	65.1	62.6	57.2	62.5	69.5	61.2	16.67	+ (.011)
454	Overall current placement office effectiveness										
	(a) Outstanding	X	9.0	4.7	3.9	3.8	4.2	4.8	6.3		
	(b) Very good	X	49.4	42.0	36.6	30.8	44.5	45.5	41.1		
	(c) Mediocre	X	27.8	36.9	38.9	44.4	33.0	37.6	36.7	71.16	+++ (.0000)
	(d) Fair	X	10.0	11.6	13.1	14.3	9.4	10.3	8.2		
	(e) Poor	X	3.9	4.7	7.5	6.8	8.9	1.8	7.6		
467	Aware of present demand in field	Yes	88.1	83.0	80.5	75.2	84.1	83.3	80.6	23.79	+++ (.0006)
	How YES information obtained										
468	(a) Placement office	X	20.5	14.8	12.9	7.2	11.6	15.2	14.5	29.18	+++ (.0001)
469	(b) Instructors	X	60.1	43.5	40.5	47.6	47.6	51.6	48.2	60.34	+++ (.0000)
470	(c) Recruiters	X	21.9	26.2	16.0	10.8	21.5	14.3	26.4	38.76	+++ (.0000)

TABLE 4.2-2. (Cont.)

VAR.	QUESTION	ANS.	% Response EDUCATION	BUSINESS & MGMT.	SOCIAL SCIENCE	PSYCHOLOGY	BIOLOGY	LETTERS & ARTS	PHYSICAL SCIENCE	x^2	SIG.
474	Aware of future employment projections in field	Yes	74.8	74.8	69.0	63.9	77.0	63.4	68.9	24.31	+++ (.0005)
	How YES information obtained										
475	(a) Placement office	X	15.1	12.9	10.2	6.0	11.6	12.4	14.5	14.70	+ (.023)
476	(b) Instructors	X	53.0	37.7	36.8	43.7	42.1	39.2	2.0	46.89	+++ (.0000)
477	(c) Recruiters	X	15.5	22.4	14.2	10.2	22.7	9.2	25.9	47.19	+++ (.0000)
479	Aware of starting salaries in field	Yes	83.1	82.6	72.4	65.6	72.5	69.4	70.4	57.54	+++ (.0000)
	How YES information obtained										
480	(a) Placement office	X	16.3	12.4	8.9	4.8	8.2	7.4	12.4	34.55	+++ (.0000)
481	(b) Instructors	X	38.9	35.9	28.5	34.7	28.8	29.0	23.3	30.64	+++ (.0000)
482	(c) Recruiters	X	26.6	31.0	19.4	10.2	22.7	17.5	28.5	49.83	+++ (.0000)
484	Placement office actively searched for a job for you	Yes	16.6	15.2	11.0	5.5	8.3	7.5	13.5	28.51	+++ (.0001)
485	Placement office instrumental in finding a job for you	Yes	22.9	23.2	17.1	10.7	14.2	11.9	20.0	28.68	+++ (.0001)
	If YES, kind of job										
486	(a) Summer	X	3.7	4.8	3.4	4.2	4.3	3.2	5.2	2.68	-
487	(b) Part-time	X	3.4	4.9	3.8	3.6	2.1	2.8	3.1	5.19	-
488	(c) Full-time	X	17.5	15.8	12.2	3.0	9.4	7.8	16.1	39.79	+++ (.0000)
489	(d) Work-study	X	3.1	2.1	1.3	1.8	1.7	1.8	0.5	8.47	-
491	Job related to major field	Yes	76.7	79.1	52.2	25.0	60.0	61.7	78.4	71.85	+++ (.0000)
492	Rate placement office effort to attract company recruiters										
	(a) Excellent	X	17.9	16.4	12.0	10.3	12.4	11.3	13.8		
	(b) Good	X	57.7	49.1	48.1	37.4	44.4	55.3	46.2	62.93	+++ (.0000)
	(c) Fair	X	21.2	28.7	31.1	43.9	33.7	27.7	30.3		
	(d) Poor	X	3.3	5.8	8.9	8.4	9.6	5.7	9.7		
493	Rate placement office success in attracting company recruiters in your field										
	(a) Excellent	X	7.3	18.0	5.6	4.3	10.2	7.6	14.3		
	(b) Good	X	43.9	48.0	24.7	12.2	31.6	27.5	31.2	266.4	+++ (.0000)
	(c) Fair	X	27.2	22.9	38.3	31.3	26.0	29.0	26.6		
	(d) Poor	X	11.6	11.2	31.5	52.2	32.2	35.9	27.9		
494	Importance of placement function as viewed by college officials										
	(a) High	X	39.0	30.8	23.6	18.2	21.4	27.4	29.2		
	(b) Moderate	X	50.7	49.7	51.3	49.7	54.8	54.2	46.2	103.5	+++ (.0000)
	(c) Low	X	9.8	18.0	22.4	28.7	19.0	18.4	22.8		
	(d) None	X	0.5	1.5	2.7	3.5	4.8	0.0	1.8		
495	Are placement activities treated as a major component of the educational process?	Yes	47.9	45.0	35.1	18.3	36.6	37.1	29.3	68.72	+++ (.0000)
496	If NO, do you believe they should be?	Yes	94.1	94.3	93.8	95.4	92.1	92.2	90.8	3.85	-

TABLE 4.2-2. (Cont.)

VAR.	QUESTION	ANS.	% Response EDUCATION	BUSINESS & MGMT.	SOCIAL SCIENCE	PSYCHOLOGY	BIOLOGY	LETTERS & ARTS	PHYSICAL SCIENCE	X^2	SIG.	
497	Rate the ability of the placement office to provide career counseling											
	(a) Excellent	X	13.8	10.0	7.7	7.4	9.5	10.3	7.8			
	(b) Good	X	48.0	44.7	44.4	27.8	43.0	45.8	41.1	41.41	++	(.0013)
	(c) Fair	X	29.5	33.2	32.9	45.4	35.2	30.3	38.3			
	(d) Poor	X	8.7	12.1	15.0	19.4	12.3	13.5	12.8			
498	Rate the ability of the placement office to provide job placement counseling											
	(a) Excellent	X	12.7	8.0	7.6	5.3	7.5	8.6	7.4			
	(b) Good	X	49.9	44.5	42.2	33.6	43.4	43.4	45.6	41.87	++	(.0012)
	(c) Fair	X	28.1	35.9	34.4	44.2	38.2	33.6	31.6			
	(d) Poor	X	9.3	11.6	15.8	16.8	11.0	14.5	15.4			
	If the placement office has not been adequate for you, to what do you attribute deficiency?											
499	(a) Inadequate staff	X	18.3	20.1	20.9	17.4	18.9	19.8	17.1	2.62	-	
500	(b) Lack of counseling experience	X	9.4	10.0	9.3	7.8	9.0	10.1	7.3	2.03	-	
501	(c) Insufficient contact with work world	X	16.0	22.6	25.8	27.5	22.7	20.7	28.5	27.93	+++	(.0001)
502	(d) Staff disinterest	X	7.3	7.9	8.0	12.0	6.9	10.6	4.7	9.42	-	
	How do you think you will most likely obtain your first job after graduating?											
504	(a) Own efforts	X	62.4	55.8	65.3	74.3	62.2	67.3	66.8	26.77	+++	(.0002)
505	(b) Placement office	X	25.1	22.6	12.2	6.6	11.6	12.9	25.9	76.87	+++	(.0000)
506	(c) Instructor's assistance	X	10.2	6.9	10.3	12.6	15.9	8.8	17.6	27.32	+++	(.0001)
507	(d) Relative's assistance	X	10.2	9.2	13.1	13.8	15.0	12.4	10.4	9.83	-	
508	(e) Friend's assistance	X	14.5	12.0	14.9	15.6	11.6	12.9	10.9	5.26	-	

I-28

Significance Code:

- - = Not significant.
- + = Significant at 95% confidence level.
- ++ = Significant at 99% confidence level.
- +++ = Significant at 99.9% confidence level.